

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 11, 2007, claims 1-8 are pending and all claims are rejected. Reconsideration is requested at least for the reasons discussed hereinbelow.

The Examiner requested that Figure 3 be corrected to be labeled as "Prior Art." A replacement sheet showing Figure 3 labeled as "Prior Art" is attached hereto. No new matter is submitted.

Objection is made to claim 1 because of the informality noted. The above amendment corrects the informality.

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is believed that the above amendment overcomes this rejection. Regarding the term "the optical pickup" in line 9 of claim 1, Applicant submits that this term may refer to any optical pickup.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Okano et al. (JP 06-131681; "Okano"). The Examiner states that Okano discloses two optical pickups (10 & 11) that are arranged so as to reproduce the same surface of the optical disk (3). However, that is not so. As can be seen in Drawing 1, optical pickup 10 is below the disk and optical pickup 11 is above the disk. Thus, the two pickups are **not arranged** so as to reproduce the **same surface** of the optical disk.

On the contrary, in the present invention, as illustrated in the embodiment in FIG. 1, optical pickup 11 and optical pickup 12 are both located beneath the optical disk so as to reproduce the **same surface** of the optical disk.

As a result, the claimed invention can provide precise tilt control so as to obtain information about an identical track on the same side of an optical disk. On the other

hand, if a sticker, printing or the like is applied to the top side of an optical disk, Okano et al. cannot detect a tilt and cannot perform precise tilt control.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner asserts that Okano discloses that the optical pickups (10 & 11) are moved in a radial direction such that the optical pickup (10) provided with the tilt sensor is moved ahead of the other optical pickup (11) provided with tilt correcting means. The Examiner references arrows in Drawing 1 as support. However, the arrows in Drawing 1 merely appear to show the operation of the tilt sensor where light emitted by LED 25 is received by the two surrounding photodiodes 16a and 16b. As far as can be seen by reference to the machine translation, there is no disclosure or suggestion, whatsoever, in Okano that "wherein the one optical pickup that is provided with the tilt detecting means is moved ahead of the other optical pickup that is provided with the tilt correcting means," as set forth in claim 3.

With respect to claim 4, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, nothing in the Okano patent claim teaches or suggests that "the one optical pickup that is provided with the tilt detecting means is moved in the radial direction of the optical disk by the guiding means to detect the tilt of the optical disk by the tilt detecting means while initial settings relating to recording or reproduction of the optical disk are performed on the other optical pickup side that is provided with the tilt correcting means, as set forth in claim 4."

With respect to claim 7, Okano does not disclose a method for correcting tilt of an optical pickup wherein a first optical pickup records or reproduces an optical disk while the first optical pickup is moved in the radial direction of the optical disk, **and** the radial position of the first optical pickup is **detected**, and wherein the second optical pickup is moved to the radial position thereby detected of the first optical pickup, as is set forth in claim 7. Okano does not provide even a hint of a suggestion that the position of one optical pickup is detected or that such detection of position is used to move the second optical pickup.

Applicant respectfully submits that Okano is deficient in at least the elements discussed above. Thus, it is not seen how the present invention is anticipated by Okano. further, it is not seen how the presently claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Okano.

In view of the above amendment, applicant respectfully submits that the pending application is in condition for allowance. An early reconsideration and notice of allowance are earnestly solicited.

If for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Dated:

9 July '07

Respectfully submitted

By

George W. Neuner

Registration No.: 26,964

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5538

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachment: Replacement Sheet - Figure 3

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figure 3 where it has now been labeled as "Prior Art."

Attachment: Replacement sheet - Figure 3
